



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,850	07/03/2003	John W. Robinson	BFGRP0313USB	6883
7590	07/06/2005		EXAMINER	
William C. Tritt Renner, Otto, Boisselle & Sklar, LLP Nineteenth Floor 1621 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44115-2191			SELLERS, ROBERT E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	
DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

<b>Application No.</b> 10/612,850	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	ROBINSON ET AL	
<b>Examiner</b> Robert Sellers	<b>Art Unit</b> 1712	

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### **Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</li> <li>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li> <li>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</li> </ol> |
|---|---|

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-12, 16 and 18, drawn to a composition comprising epoxy resin(s), reactive liquid polymer(s) and reaction product(s) of an epoxy resin and a reactive liquid polymer, classified in class 525, subclass 526.
  - II. Claims 13, 14, 19 and 20, drawn to the composition of Group I further comprising a reactive diluent, classified in class 525, subclass 502.
  - III. Claims 15 and 21, drawn to the composition of Group I further comprising a curing agent, classified in class 525, subclass 533.
  - IV. Claims 22-27, drawn to a method of impregnating, classified in class 264, subclass 331.12.
  - V. Claims 28 and 29, drawn to a laminate, classified in class 428, subclass 297.4.

The inventions are distinct from each other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and (II or III or V) are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a coating formulation and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

3. The reactive diluent in the composition of Group II is a functionally different reactive component from the curing agent in the composition of Group III and confers materially different physical properties thereto.

4. Inventions IV and V are related as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown:

(1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, that the process as claimed can be used to make another materially different product such as a permeable reinforcing material impregnated with a polyurethane.

5. The impregnating process of Group IV forms a structurally distinct prepeg from the mere mixture of components required in the compositions of Group I, II or III.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification.

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

a) The epoxy resins wherein a single species is selected from page 6, line 4 to page 7, line 25 of the specification. Example 1 in the table on page 18 shows a blend of Epon 862 and Epon 58006. However, the chemical structures and/or chemical names of these species are not revealed.

b) The reactive liquid polymers such as the epoxy-terminated butadiene acrylonitrile liquid rubber used in the table on page 18.

c) The epoxy resins and reactive liquid polymers constituting reaction product c).

Contingent upon the election of Group II, items a), b) and c) hereinabove and

d) the reactive diluents such as the Heloxy 61 employed in the table on page 18 which is butyl glycidyl ether according to page 15, line 6.

Contingent upon the election of Group III, items a), b) and c) hereinabove and

e) the curing agents such as the Lidride 6 exemplified on page 17, line 22 which is methylhexahydrophthalic anhydride according to page 16, lines 24-25.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-29 are generic.

A reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species ***within each of items a), b) and c), hereinabove and d) or e), if appropriate,*** that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1712

A telephone call was made to Neil DuChez on June 30, 2005 to request an oral election to the above restriction and election of species requirement, but did not result in an election being made. The reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention and species to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Sellers whose telephone number is (571) 272-1093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert Sellers  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1712

rs

6/30/2005